

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE
11-26-01ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME
Est. 688-L Fontane del Duca S.R.L.

Sala Baganza

COUNTRY
ItalyNAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto UrbanNAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Cesare Allodi

EVALUATION

☒ Acceptable ☐ Acceptable/
Re-review ☐ Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1 CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 M	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 C
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 O	Imports	81 C
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 A
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-26-01	Est. 688-L Fontane del Duca S.R.L.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

7 Insectocutor observed over the product in several areas on the establishment. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.

19 Several plastic trays were observed to be broken and metal racks were observed with pieces of fat. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment.

34, 35 The SSOP pre-operational sanitation preventive action was missing and deficiencies were not clearly identified. The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once in two months and operational sanitation once a week for one hour.

43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.

76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

12/14/01

Est. 714-L Levoni S.P.A.

COUNTRY
ItalyNAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto UrbanNAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Cesare Allodi

EVALUATION



Acceptable

Acceptable/
Re-review

Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 M	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/14/01	Est. 714-L Levoni S.P.A.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

- 19 Dirty racks were observed in the fatting room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment employee.
- 28 Small pieces of stones were found on the product in the salting room. This was corrected by the establishment.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month and operational sanitation once a week.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured by this establishment.
82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		REVIEW DATE <div style="text-align: center;">12/04/01</div>	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME <div style="text-align: center;">Est. 720-L A E B Prosciutti SPA</div>		CITY San Daniele D Friuli
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM				COUNTRY ITALY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry		NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Caliz		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)
 A = Acceptable M = Marginally Acceptable U = Unacceptable N = Not Reviewed O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY
	12/04/01	Est. 720-L A E B Prosciutti SPA	San Daniele D Friuli
			COUNTRY
			ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. Caliz		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

31. Product that contacted the floor (drop meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.

34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed one to two times a month.

43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.

76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

B. The supervisory visits that were performed were not done monthly. Only four visits were conducted per year by the local district/provincial officials.

C. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing adequate daily inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment one to two times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and the duration of visits was between one to two hours.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE
11-22-01ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME
Est. 744-L Parmacotto S.P.A.

Sala Baganza

COUNTRY
ItalyNAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto UrbanNAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Noe & Pierantoni

EVALUATION

☐ Acceptable☒ Acceptable/
Re-review☐ Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 M	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 M
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 M	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 U	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 M	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 M	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 C
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A		83
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-22-01	Est. 744-L Parmacotto S.P.A.	Jasa Dagana COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Noe & Pierantoni		EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

5 The sanitizer in the receiving room did not have enough water. This was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.

7 Spider webs were observed in the receiving cooler. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.

7/9 There was a space under the door sufficient for rodent to get in to the shipping room. The frequency of rodent control performed by the contracted company was not sufficient (every second month). This was scheduled for correction by the establishment officials.

28 The plastic felt down on the floor was picked up by an employee who did not change his gloves and continue to work in the molding room. The company scheduled the training of the employee.

30 Oil spots were found on the ham in two cases in the receiving cooler. This was corrected immediately by the establishment employee.

34, 35 Several dirty equipment (metal bins) with pieces of meat and fat observed in the massaging room. This deficiency was found despite of a report of the proper task accomplishment from the pre-operational sanitation monitoring and verification personnel. This deficiency requires employee training, which will be performed by the company. The government inspector was performing pre-operational and operational sanitation twice or three times a week for two hours.

43 There was no identification of inedible metal cars in the storage room next to the pumping of hams. This was scheduled for correction by the company employees. The condemned product is not denatured in Italy.

58 There is an incorrect statement on the label of Leonardo ham declaring that the pigs used are from Italy. The origin of pigs is from Denmark. The establishment scheduled this deficiency for correction.

76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation. Corrective actions to be taken when critical limits were exceeded were not sufficiently described and clarification was needed regarding the intended consumers of the finished product.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

11-29-01

Est. 758-L Langhiranese Prosciutti S.R.L.

Langhirano

COUNTRY
Italy

NAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto Urban

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Drs. Allodi & Stefano

EVALUATION

☐ Acceptable

☒ Acceptable/
Re-review

☐ Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 M	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 M	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-29-01	Est. 758-L Langhiranese Prosciutti S.R.L.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Drs. Allodi & Stefano		EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unaccept

COMMENTS:

- 4 Paper towel was found to continuously contacting piece of equipment. This deficiency was corrected immediately.
- 9 Insectocuters were observed over the product in several areas in the establishment. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.
- 11 Inspection table and sufficient light were missing in the meat receiving room. This was scheduled for correction.
- 17 Flaking paint close to the product but not over it was observed in the salting room and drying room. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment management.
- 19/34 Plastic plates used for ham salting were not clean before the start of operation in the salting room. There was no immediate corrective action by the establishment or inspection service.
- 19/34 The conveyor belt was found with pieces of dry meat before operation in the receiving room. No corrective action performed either by the company or inspection service.
- 19/35 Clean and dirty plastic plates were not separated after the washing. No corrective action by the establishment or the inspection service were observed.
- 30 Product (remains of hams) were observed on the wall in the drying room. No corrective action by the establishment was performed during the audit.
- 34/35 The preoperational and operational sanitation deficiencies observed were not reported in the SSOP documents. This is going to be corrected by the establishment. The SSOP preventive action was not performed and deficiencies observed during the audit were recorded in the SSOP records. The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month and operational sanitation once a week.
- 43 Inedible barrels were used for storing edible product in the salting room. The corrective action observed was removal of inedible mark from the barrel by the consortium representative. The new edible container contained inedible product and equipment that had not been washed. The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to high levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation. A portion of the corrective action was misplaced under monitoring activities and CCPs were not defined by number.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		REVIEW DATE 11/26/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 791 M/S Italcarni Soc. Coop. A.R.L.		CITY Migliarina Di Carpi COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry		NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Pierantoni, Dr. Noe, & Dr. Emiore Vezzani		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)
 A = Acceptable M = Marginally Acceptable U = Unacceptable N = Not Reviewed O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention		28 A	Formulations	55 O
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing		29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage		30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning		31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation		32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM			Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program		33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation		34 A	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 M	Operational sanitation		35 A	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal		36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL			Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification		37 A	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 M	Antemortem inspec. procedures		38 A	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions		39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter		40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures		41 A	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions		42 A	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control		43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control		44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product		45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL			Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance		46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures		47 A	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures		48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Approval of chemicals, etc.		49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals		50 A	Species verification	79 C
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL			"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim		51 A	Imports	81 C
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection		52 O	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification		53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients		54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY
	11/26/01	Est. 791 M/S Italcarni Soc. Coop. A.R.L.	Migliarina Di Carpi
			COUNTRY
			ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Pierantoni, Dr. Noe, & Dr. Emore Vezzani	EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

COMMENTS:

07. Gaps at the bottoms of door in the deboning room and casing room were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction.

11. Light at the hog head inspection station was inadequate and was not shadow proof. Establishment officials ordered correction.

31. Product that contacted the floor (drop meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with light, hand-washing, and sanitizing facility. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.

43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.

76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective action in the even that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		REVIEW DATE <div style="text-align: center;">11/16/01</div>	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 989-L Corte Buona S.P.A.		CITY Paliano (PR) COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faiz Choudry & Dr. Oto Urban		NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Maestripietri, IIC & Dr. Pietro Noe		EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)
 A = Acceptable M = Marginally Acceptable U = Unacceptable N = Not Reviewed O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 M	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 U	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 U	Processing equipment	62 A
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 U	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 M	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 U	Returned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 M	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 U	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 A
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 A
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 U
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE 11/16/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 989-L Corte Buona S.P.A.	CITY Paliano (PR)
			COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faiz Choudry & Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Maestriperi, IIC & Dr. Pietro Noe	EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

COMMENTS:

05. Sanitizer was not working during the operation in the processing room. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.

07. Door was not effectively shut in the product receiving room and cover over the vent was broken in the smoking room. Flies were observed in the processing and packaging rooms. Establishment officials ordered correction.

17 A. Dripping condensate, from overhead refrigeration units that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, was falling in one cooler. There was no product underneath at the time of audit. B. Dripping condensate, from ceilings that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, was falling onto hams in the cooking and smoking rooms and also ceilings were observed with mildew. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.

18. Overhead ceilings in the processing room were observed with accumulation of pieces of fat, meat, and dirt.

19, 28. In the processing rooms: containers for edible product were found with grease, fat, and broken; conveyor belt for edible product, brine injection equipment, working tables, and molds for ham were found with fat and pieces of meat from previous days' operation. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.

26. Several employees were not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent product contamination such as: plastic packaging material was contacting floor during packaging; cartons were kept on the floor and dirty steel was kept on the working table.

34. 35 A. The daily pre-operational and operational sanitation monitoring deficiencies were not identified and any corrective actions taken were not documented by the establishment personnel and SSOP records did not reflect the actual sanitary conditions observed in the establishment. B. GOI meat inspection officials were not monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.

43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination and/or cross utilization. B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized before leaving establishment. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.

76 A. The FSIS auditors could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements. B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment three times a week (the establishment was working five days per week) and the duration of visits was one hour.

79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.

80. Because of gross product contamination and lack of compliance with daily pre-operational and operational sanitation/equivalent sanitation programs and procedures, inadequate inspectional controls, and noncompliance with basic FSIS regulatory requirements of HACCP program, the status of this establishment is not equivalent to that required in the U.S. program. All the above deficiencies were discussed with Dr. Maestriperi, IIC, and Dr. Pietro Noe and they agreed to remove Establishment 989-L from the list of establishments eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States, effective November 16, 2001.

82. This establishment did not meet some the the FSIS basic regulatory requirements of the HACCP program. In addition, the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; the intended use of the product or end used had not been identified; there was not a HACCP plan for each product where a hazard had been identified; all hazards identified were not addressed by a CCP; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations; and (12) pre-shipment document reviews were not being conducted by establishment officials.

NOTE: This establishment was unacceptable during the last audit in May, 2001.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

12-12-01

Est. 1170-L Brendolan Service SRL

COUNTRY
ItalyNAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto UrbanNAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Ivonne Caliz

EVALUATION

☒ Acceptable☐ Acceptable/
Re-review☐ Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 O
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 M
Back siphonage prevention	03 O	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 O	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-12-01	Est. 1170-L Brendolan Service SRL	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Ivonne Caliz	EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	

COMMENTS:

4 The flipping top on waste receptacles was observed at the hand washing facilities across the establishment. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management.

34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once in 14 days and operational sanitation once a week. The SSOP corrective action was not specific enough and the preventive action needs to be included. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment management.

43 The edible plastic container was observed to be set on the floor in the slicing room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management. The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.

58 The establishment label approval indicates the European Union number not the one approved for the U.S.A. This was scheduled to be corrected by the establishment management.

76a The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

76b Internal reviews were performed only four times per year.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		REVIEW DATE 11-28-01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 1217 Stagionatura Prosciutti Torione		Lesignanobagni
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM					COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below) A = Acceptable M = Marginally Acceptable U = Unacceptable N = Not Reviewed O = Does not apply					
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention		28 A	Formulations 55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing		29 A	Packaging materials 56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage		30 A	Laboratory confirmation 57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning		31 A	Label approvals 58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation		32 N	Special label claims 59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM			Inspector monitoring 60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program		33 A	Processing schedules 61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation		34 M	Processing equipment 62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 M	Operational sanitation		35 M	Processing records 63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal		36 A	Empty can inspection 64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 M	2. DISEASE CONTROL			Filling procedures 65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification		37 O	Container closure exam 66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures		38 O	Interim container handling 67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions		39 O	Post-processing handling 68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter		40 O	Incubation procedures 69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures		41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant 70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions		42 O	Processing control -- inspection 71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control		43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control		44 A	Export product identification 72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Returned and rework product		45 A	Inspector verification 73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL			Export certificates 74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance		46 O	Single standard 75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures		47 O	Inspection supervision 76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures		48 O	Control of security items 77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.		49 A	Shipment security 78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals		50 A	Species verification 79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL			"Equal to" status 80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim		51 A	Imports 81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection		52 O	HACCP 82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification		53 A	
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients		54 O	

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-28-01	Est. 1217 Stagionatura Prosciutti Torione	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

7, 9 Insectocutors were located over the product traffic areas in the receiving, drying and shipping rooms. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.

17 The ceiling over the product was crumbling in two places in the drying room. Product was moved away from the affected area and this deficiency was scheduled for correction by the establishment officials.

34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation twice a year and operational sanitation twice a week for the duration of the visit of one to two hours. The pre-operational preventive action was missing.

43 The inedible product was not denatured at this establishment.

76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

12-03-01

Est. 1223-L Prosciuttificio MOZZANI S.P.A.

Felino

COUNTRY
Italy

NAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. Oto Urban

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Cesare Allodi

EVALUATION

☒ Acceptable ☐ Acceptable/
Re-review ☐ Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)

A = Acceptable

M = Marginally Acceptable

U = Unacceptable

N = Not Reviewed

O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 M	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingredients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-03-01	Est. 1223-L Prosciuttificio MOZZANI S.P.A.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi		EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

5 The water temperature in both sanitizers was below the required temperature of 82C in the deboning room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.

26 The box with strings destined to be used for the edible product were stored on the floor. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management.

34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation twice a year and operational sanitation once a week.

43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.

76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.